

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the patent application. The Examiner has finally rejected Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-21 and 24-27 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Kuhn, et al and Claims 4-5, 13-14, and 22-23 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the teachings of Kuhn in view of Gandhi. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited prior art.

The present invention is directed to a voice processing system which dynamically allocates sets of engines, or task servers, for voice processing applications based on parameter settings of the engines. The parameters may include, as taught by the present Specification at page 7, line 5 and again at page 13, lines 9-21, a grammar type, an accuracy reading, and an acoustic model. A configuration file is maintained for a current configuration of the voice processing engines. The configuration file comprises a record of the configuration of sets of the plurality of engines and includes the parameter settings (see: page 5, lines 17-20). When a request is received, the task routing

YOR920030391US1**-8-**

system analyzes the request to ascertain the particular resources from the task servers which are required to process the particular task based on the characteristics of the voice input and based on the configuration file. The task routing system selects a set of engines based on the types of engines in the configuration files, using the parameter settings listed in the configuration file.

The Kuhn patent teaches a voice call system wherein voice call data is received and the grammar type (e.g., numbers or words) is identified by the speech application. Then the information is sent to a resource manager which monitors shared processing resources and identifies a preferred processor based on two considerations, namely the load on the processors and the known processor efficiency for the identified grammar type. Kuhn does not select a set of engines based on the type of engines and parameter settings in configuration data; rather, Kuhn selects a processor based on a sum of the total and usage numbers (see: Col. 4, lines 60-61) representing its efficiency and load. The Kuhn numbers are found in a table which is accessed by the resource manager.

YOR920030391US1

-9-

The Examiner has cited the resource managers 108 of Kuhn as anticipating the plurality of task servers. Applicants respectfully disagree. The resource managers of Kuhn are not task servers and are not comprises of a plurality of engines for processing voice input. Rather, the resource managers of Kuhn are stand-alone entities which are notified of incoming utterances by the RecClients, consult tables, and tell the RecClients where to send the incoming utterances (Col. 4, lines 54-57). Clearly the resource managers are not "task servers comprising a plurality of engines of a plurality of types for processing voice input" as set forth in Claim 1.

The Examiner cites the RecClients 104 against the plurality of engines. However, the Kuhn RecClients are not "engines of a plurality of types for processing voice input" as is claimed. Rather, the RecClients are simply routers which receive the incoming utterances and direct them to RecServers based on input from the resource managers. Nothing in Kuhn teaches that the RecClients are of a plurality of types, nor that the RecClients are engines for processing voice inputs.

The Examiner has cited the teachings from Col. 3, lines 11-22 of Kuhn against the claimed configuration file.

YOR920030391US1

-10-

However, the cited passage describes a speech application which is expecting certain utterance types. Such an application does not anticipate a configuration file connected to the task routing system wherein the configuration file comprises a record of a configuration of sets of the plurality of engines and parameter settings for each type of engine, as set forth in Claim 1. Applicants additionally aver that the table described in the Kuhn patent is not a configuration file and does not comprise configuration data, since Kuhn does not teach or suggest that sets of engines are configured or that configuration data with parameter settings is maintained for sets of engines.

Applicants note that Claim 1 further recites "wherein the task routing system determines characteristics of the voice input and selects a set of the plurality of engines to process incoming voice input based on the determined characteristics of the voice input and on the types of engines in the configuration file." Kuhn does not teach or suggest selecting a set of a plurality of engines to process incoming voice input based on a configuration file with parameter settings for types of engines configured in sets.

YOR920030391US1

-11-

Applicants herein submit amendments to the independent claims to highlight the distinctions over the cited art. The amendments do not introduce any new matter and are fully supported by the original specification. Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the plurality of engines are for processing voice input, to distinguish from the cited Kuhn RecClients that simply route utterances. Applicants have also amended the claims to recite the configuration file/data as comprising a record of the configuration of sets of engines and parameter settings. Although Applicants had clearly defined the configuration file/data in the specification (see: page 5, lines 18-20), Applicants are including the language in the claims as well, in order to fully distinguish the configuration data/file from the table of Kuhn.

For a patent to anticipate another invention under 35 USC § 102(b), the patent must clearly teach each and every claimed feature of the anticipated invention. Anticipation under 35 USC 102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of a claimed invention. See: *In re Schreiber*, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Paulsen*, 30 F. 3d 1475, 1478-1479, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In*

YOR920030391US1

-12-

re *Spada*, 911 F. 2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990) and *RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc.*, 730 F. 2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Since the Kuhn patent clearly does not teach a plurality of task servers, a configuration file as claimed, parameter settings for each engine type, or a task routing system which selects a set of engines based on configuration data comprising parameter settings which indicate the engine type, it cannot be maintained that the Kuhn patent anticipates each and every claim feature.

Applicants further assert that the Gandhi patent publication does not provide those teachings which are missing from the Kuhn patent. Gandhi is cited for teachings acoustic models and accuracy models. However, Gandhi does not teach or suggest a plurality of task servers, a configuration file/data with parameter settings for each engine type, or a task routing system which selects a set of engines based on configuration data comprising parameter settings which indicate the engine type. For a determination of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art" (*In re Wilson*, 424 F. 2d 1382,

YOR920030391US1

-13-


1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970). If the cited references fail to teach each and every one of the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants conclude that the finding of obviousness cannot be maintained.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Ea-Ee Jan

By:


Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910

YOR920030391US1

-14-